UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/553,648 | 10/14/2005 | Junbiao Zhang | PU030121 | 5569 |

24498 7590 08/18/2010

Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| MILLER, BRANDON J | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2617 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 08/18/2010 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/553,648 | ZHANG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | BRANDON J. MILLER | 2617 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 March 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-9 and 12-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-9 and 12-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 October 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

I. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/01/2010 has been entered and claims 1, 4-9, and 12-16 are pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.,* 383 U.S. 1,148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

II. Claims 1, 4-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (US 7,177,637 B2) in view of Hopprich et al. (US 6,792,474 B1).

Regarding claim 1 Liu teaches a method for offering wireless network access to both guests (408, FIG. 4) and local users (406, FIG. 4) (see col. 4, lines 61-67 and col. 5, lines 1-2). Liu teaches receiving at a common wireless network access point (402, FIG. 4) a request for access from one of a guest and local user (see col. 4, lines 61-64 and col. 6, lines 29-30). Liu teaches determining (504, FIG. 5) at the wireless network access point whether the access request was received from local user or guest (see col. 5, lines 14-18 & 59-65, AP controls access to network by both authorized MUs (local user) and non-authorized MUs (guest) according to scheme permitting access to both (see col. 2, lines 1-3 & 48-53). This indicates that AP can determine whether request for access was from a local user or guest). Liu teaches authenticating the request for access received at the common access point depending on whether the request was received from the guest or local user (see col. 3, lines 33-35 and col. 6, lines 35-38); if such authentication is successful, then routing traffic from the local user differently from the guest (see col. 3, lines 25-31 & 48-53) and limiting traffic from said guest according to a guest access policy (see col. 3, lines 1-3 & 48-53, scheme that permits non-authorized (guest)

MUs to access public or limited regions of a network reads on limiting traffic from the guest according to a guest access policy).

Liu does not specifically teach the determining including examining a user domain received from a party seeking access to determine whether such user domain designates a guest domain.

Hopprich teaches determining that includes examining a user domain received from a requesting party (110, FIG. 1) to determine whether such user domain designates a guest domain (see col. 23, lines 17-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the determining in Liu adapt to include examining a user domain received from a party seeking access to determine whether such user domain designates a guest domain because the access point in Liu can be modified to examine user domains as taught in Hopprich and it would allow for a robust authentication and verification technique for authenticating and verifying a local user or guest requesting network access (see Hopprich, col. 4, lines 59-62).

Regarding claim 4 Liu and Hopprich teach the method according to claim 1 except for communicating a request for authentication to one or more authentication servers, the authentication being performed differently depending on whether the party seeking access is a local user or a guest.

Liu does teach communicating a request for authentication, the authentication being performed differently depending on whether the party seeking access is a local user or a guest (see col. 3, lines 25-35 & 42-44 and col. 6, lines 33-40).

Hopprich does teach communicating a request for authentication to one or more authentication servers (see col. 12, lines 24-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the method of the Liu and Hopprich combination adapt to include communicating a request for authentication to one or more authentication servers, the authentication being performed differently depending on whether the party seeking access is a local user or a guest because a server can perform the authentication process in Liu and Hopprich combination and it would allow for a robust authentication and verification technique for authenticating and verifying a local user or guest requesting network access (see Hopprich, col. 4, lines 59-62).

Regarding claim 5 Liu and Hopprich teach the method according to claim 1 except for communicating a request for authentication to a single authentication server that performs authentication using different credentials for local users and guests.

Liu does teach performing authentication using different credentials for local users and guests (see col. 6, lines 33-40).

Hopprich does teach communicating a request for authentication to a single authentication server (see col. 12, lines 24-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include communicating a request for authentication to a single authentication server which performs authentication using different credentials for local users and guests because a server can perform the authentication process in Liu and Hopprich combination and it would allow for a robust authentication and verification technique for

authenticating and verifying a local user or guest requesting network access (see Hopprich, col. 4, lines 59-62).

Regarding claim 6 Liu teaches ascertaining whether the request for access was received in an IEEE 802.1x format (see col. 3, lines 25-30).

Regarding claim 7 Liu routing traffic from a guest to an external network (see col. 4, lines 4-8 & 28-30).

Regarding claim 8 Liu teaches routing traffic from a local user to a corporate intranet (see col. 3, lines 50-53).

Regarding claim 9 Liu teaches a wireless local are network for offering wireless Network access to both guests (408, FIG. 4) and local users (406, FIG. 4) (see col. 4, lines 61-67 and col. 5, lines 1-2). Liu teaches at least one common wireless network access point (402, FIG. 4) offering access to both guests and local users in response to a request for access (see col. 4, lines 61-64 and col. 6, lines 29-30). Liu teaches said access point determining (504, FIG. 5) whether the access request was received from a local user or a guest (see col. 3, lines 33-35 and col. 6, lines 35-38, AP controls access to network by both authorized MUs (local user) and non-authorized MUs (guest) according to scheme permitting access to both (see col. 2, lines 1-3 & 48-53). This indicates that AP can determine whether request for access was from a local user or guest). Liu teaches authenticating the request for access depending on whether the request was received from the guest or local user (see col. 3, lines 33-35 and col. 6, lines 35-38); means coupled to the at least one wireless access point for routing traffic from the local user differently from the guest (see col. 3, lines 25-31 & 48-53); and means for limiting traffic from said guest according to a guest access policy (see col. 3, lines 1-3 & 48-53, scheme that permits non-

authorized (guest) MUs to access public or limited regions of a network reads on limiting traffic from the guest according to a guest access policy).

Liu does not specifically teach a server for authenticating; and determining that includes examining if a user domain received with the access request designates a guest domain.

Hopprich teaches at least one server coupled for authenticating (see col. 12, lines 1-5); and determining that includes examining a user domain received from a requesting party to determine whether such user domain designates a guest domain (see col. 23, lines 17-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the network in Liu adapt to include a server for authenticating; and determining that includes examining if a user domain received with the access request designates a guest domain because a server can perform the authentication process in Liu and the access point in Liu can be modified to examine user domains as taught in Hopprich, allowing for a robust authentication and verification technique for authenticating and verifying a local user or guest requesting network access (see Hopprich, col. 4, lines 59-62).

Regarding claim 12 Liu and Hopprich teach limitations as recited in claim 5 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

III. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liu et al. (US 7,177,637 B2) in view of Hopprich et al. (US 6,792,474 B1) and Anton, Jr. (US 2002/0157090 A1).

Regarding claim 13 Liu and Hopprich teach the network according to claim 9 except for wherein the at least one wireless network access point ascertains whether the request for access was received in an IEEE 802.1x format or was received in a web-browser format.

Liu does teach wherein the at least one wireless network access point ascertains whether the request for access was received in an IEEE 802.1x format (see col. 3, lines 20-35).

Anton, Jr. teaches a request for access received in a web-browser format (see paragraph [0026]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the network in the Liu and Hopprich combination adapt to include wherein the at least one wireless network access point ascertains whether the request for access was received in an IEEE 802.1x format or was received in a web-browser format because it would allow for an efficient way to accurately identify guest users (see Anton, Jr., bottom of paragraph [0025]).

Regarding claim 14 Liu and Hopprich teach the network according to claim 9 except for wherein the means for routing traffic includes a firewall.

Anton, Jr. teaches means for routing traffic that includes a firewall (see paragraph [0024]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the network in the Liu and Hopprich combination adapt to include wherein the means for routing traffic includes a firewall because it would allow network which provides a secure environment for network access (see Anton, Jr., paragraph [0022]).

Regarding claim 15 Liu and Hopprich teach the network according to claim 15 except for providing web browser based authentication if the request for access was not received in the IEEE 802.1x format.

Liu does teach authentication for a user in a public mode if the request for access was not received in the IEEE 802.1x format (see col. 3, lines 1-3 & 25-30 and col. 4, lines 1-3).

Anton, Jr. teaches providing web browser based authentication (see paragraph [0023]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the network in the Liu and Hopprich combination adapt to include providing web browser based authentication if the request for access was not received in the IEEE 802.1x format because it would allow for an efficient way to authenticate a guest user (see Anton, Jr., bottom of pg. 3, paragraph [0027]).

Regarding claim 16 Liu and Hopprich teach limitations as recited in claim 15 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

***Response to Arguments***

IV. Applicant's arguments filed March 01, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1 and 9 the combination of Liu and Hopprich teach a device as claimed. Specifically, Liu teaches limiting traffic from said guest according to a guest access policy (see col. 3, lines 1-3 & 48-53). The scheme of Liu that permits non-authorized (guest) MUs to access public or limited regions of a network reads on and relates to limiting traffic from the guest according to a guest access policy.

***Conclusion***

V. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Krantz et al. Pub. No.: US 2004/0111520 A1 discloses increasing the level of automation when provisioning a computer system to access a network.

Bahl et al. Patent No.: US 6,834,341 B1 discloses authentication methods and systems for accessing networks, authentication methods and systems for accessing the Internet.

Redlich Patent No.: US 6,591,306 B1 discloses IP network access for portable devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON J. MILLER whose telephone number is (571)272-7869. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brandon J Miller/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

August 4, 2010